REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-18, and 20-22 and 25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, 18, and 22 are the independent claims.

Claims 20, 23, and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 18, 22 and 25 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 18, 20, and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP11-306570 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,666,843 (Ezawa et al.). Claims 3-7, 21, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP11-306570 in view of Ezawa et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,091,553 (Song et al.). Claims 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0193854 (Lee et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,446,721 (Sekimoto et al.). Claims 18 and 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP11-306570 in view of Ezawa et al., and further in view of Song et al. and unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Sekimoto et al. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia, that a first damping member is inserted in a center portion of focusing coils.

Independent claim 10 recites, inter alia, a damping member inserted in shoulder portions of both sides of a receiving hole.

Independent claim 18 recites, inter alia, inserting at least one damping member in at least one location of an optical pickup, the at least one location being a center of the focusing coils of the optical pickup or in each corner of the bobbin of the optical pickup.

Independent claim 22 recites, inter alia, reducing a frequency of a second resonance peak of an optical pickup by damping vibration of the optical pickup during tracking at at least one location where great change occurs during the tracking, by damping vibration at a center of focusing coils of the optical pickup by inserting at least one damping member in the center of the focusing coils or damping vibration at corners of a bobbin of the optical pickup by inserting at least one damping member in each corner of the bobbin.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the asserted citations disclose at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 10, 18, and 22. Thus, without

conceding the propriety of the asserted combinations, it is respectfully submitted that the asserted combinations are likewise deficient for at least the reasons set forth below, even in view of the knowledge of those of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Shinokawa et al. and Ezawa et al., the Office Action acknowledges that the primary citation to Shinokawa et al. does not disclose at least one damping member. (Office Action, page 3).

The secondary citation to Ezawa et al. discusses an arrangement including viscoelastic members 3a and 3b respectively between focusing coils 4a and 4a and a lens holder 2. (Ezawa et al.; FIG. 6). The Office Action contends that these viscoelastic members are disposed at the center portions of the focusing coils (Office Action, page 3). However, assuming arguendo that this characterization is correct, the viscoelastic members are not inserted in a center portion of focusing coils (independent claims 1, 18 and 22) or in each corner of the bobbin of the optical pickup (independent claims 18 and 22). Thus, the combination of Shinokawa et al. and Ezawa et al. cannot reasonably be said to disclose at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 1, 18, and 22.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 18 and 22 under § 103 in view of Shinokawa et al. and Ezawa et al. and Song et al., as explained above, the combination of Shimokawa et al. and Ezawa et al. does not disclose the aforementioned features of independent claims 18 and 22.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The tertitiary citation to Song et al. relates to a pickup actuator and discusses an arrangement including damping members 80 and 80' respectively between supporting plates 70 and 70' and magnet 30' and supporting plates 90 and 90' and magnet 30. (Song et al., Col. 6, lines 10-26; Col. 7, lines 5-27; FIG. 8). The Office Action contends that this arrangement discloses locating damping members at corners of a bobbin. (Office Action, page 10). However, assuming arguendo that this characterizations correct, the damping members are not inserted in a center portion of focusing coils or in each corner of the bobbin of the optical pickup. Thus, Song et al. does not add anything that cures the aforementioned deficiency in the combination of Shimokawa et al. and Ezawa et al.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully

traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 10, 18, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Office Action acknowledges that the primary citation to Lee et al. does not disclose a damping member. (Office Action, page 7).

The secondary citation to Sekimoto et al. relates to an objective lens drive device with a support system and discusses an arrangement including a damper member 16 located on a flexible body that supports movable portions of an optical pickup. (Sekimoto et al., Col. 4, lines 37-47; Fig. 2E). The Office Action contends that this damping member discloses damping members located at corners of a bobbin. However, assuming arguendo that this characterization correct, the damping members are not inserted in the shoulder portions of both sides of a receiving hole.

Thus, the combination of Lee et al. and Sekimoto et al. cannot reasonably be said to disclose at least the aforementioned features of independent claim 10. Also, absent from the combination of Lee et al. and Sekimoto et al. is any disclosure of inserting a damping member in a center portion of focusing coils. Thus, the combination of Lee et al. and Sekimoto et al. cannot reasonably be said to disclose at least the aforementioned features of independent claims 18 and 22.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this Amendment After Final Rejection clearly places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Amendment as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such

matters.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 9-7-06

By: _____
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501